

1 Introduction

If $p(x)$ is a polynomial of degree $n \geq 2$ with n distinct real roots $r_1 < r_2 < \dots < r_n$ and critical points $x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_{n-1}$, let

$$\sigma_k = \frac{x_k - r_k}{r_{k+1} - r_k}, k = 1, 2, \dots, n-1.$$

$(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n-1})$ is called the *ratio vector* of p , and σ_k is called the k th ratio. Ratio vectors were first discussed in [4] and in [1], where the inequality $\frac{1}{n-k+1} < \sigma_k < \frac{k}{k+1}, k = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ was derived. For $n = 3$ it was shown in [1] that σ_1 and σ_2 satisfy the polynomial equation $3(1 - \sigma_1)\sigma_2 - 1 = 0$. In addition, necessary and sufficient conditions were given in [5] for (σ_1, σ_2) to be a ratio vector. For $n = 4$, a polynomial, Q , in three variables was given in [5] with the property that $Q(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3) = 0$ for any ratio vector $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$. It was also shown that the ratios are monotonic—that is, $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2 < \sigma_3$ for any ratio vector $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$. For $n = 3$, $\frac{1}{3} < \sigma_1 < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma_2 < \frac{2}{3}$, and thus it follows immediately that $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2$. The monotonicity of the ratios does not hold in general for $n \geq 5$ (see [5]). Further results on ratio vectors for $n = 4$ were proved by the author in [6]. In particular, necessary and sufficient conditions were given for $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$ to be a ratio vector. We now want to extend the notion of ratio vector to polynomial like functions of the form $p(x) = (x - r_1)^{m_1} \dots (x - r_N)^{m_N}$, where $m_1, \dots, m_N$ are given positive real numbers and $r_1 < r_2 < \dots < r_N$. We extend some of the results and simplify some of the proofs in [5] and in [6], and we prove some new results as well. In particular, we derive more general

bounds on the σ_k (Theorem 3). Even for $N = 3$ or $N = 4$, the monotonicity of the ratios does not hold in general for all positive real numbers $m_1, \dots, m_N$. We provide examples below and we also derive necessary and sufficient conditions on m_1, m_2, m_3 which imply that $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2$ (Theorem 5). Finally, we prove some general results for any N using Projective Elimination Theory (see Proposition 12). Proposition 12 can be used to provide necessary and sufficient conditions for $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1})$ to be a ratio vector. In particular, we show (Corollary 13) that there is a polynomial $Q \neq 0$ in $N - 1$ variables with real coefficients and which does not depend on $r_1, \dots, r_N, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1}$, such that $Q(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1}) = 0$ for every ratio vector $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1})$.

2 Main Results

Throughout,

$$p(x) = (x - r_1)^{m_1} \cdots (x - r_N)^{m_N},$$

where $m_1, \dots, m_N$ are given positive real numbers with $\sum_{k=1}^N m_k = n$ and $r_1 < r_2 < \cdots < r_N$. We need the following lemmas.

Lemma 1 *p' has exactly one root, $x_k \in I_k = (r_k, r_{k+1}), k = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$.*

Proof. By Rolle's Theorem, p' has at least one root in I_k for each $k = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1$. Now $\frac{p'}{p} = \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{m_k}{x - r_k}$, which has at most $N - 1$ real roots since $\left\{ \frac{1}{x - r_k} \right\}_{k=1, \dots, N}$ is a Chebyshev system. ■

Now we define the $N - 1$ ratios

$$\sigma_k = \frac{x_k - r_k}{r_{k+1} - r_k}, k = 1, 2, \dots, N - 1. \quad (1)$$

$(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1})$ is called the *ratio vector* of p . We shall derive a system of nonlinear equations in the $\{r_k\}$ and $\{\sigma_k\}$. By the product rule, $p'(x) = (x - r_1)^{m_1-1} \dots (x - r_N)^{m_N-1} \times \left(\sum_{j=1}^N m_j \prod_{i=1, i \neq j}^N (x - r_i) \right)$. Since $p'(x) = n(x - r_1)^{m_1-1} \dots (x - r_N)^{m_N-1} \times \prod_{k=1}^{N-1} (x - x_k)$ as well, we have

$$n \prod_{k=1}^{N-1} (x - x_k) = \sum_{j=1}^N m_j \left(\prod_{i=1, i \neq j}^N (x - r_i) \right). \quad (2)$$

Let $e_k \equiv e_k(r_1, \dots, r_n)$ denote the k th elementary symmetric function of the r_j , $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$, starting with $e_0(r_1, \dots, r_n) = 1$, $e_1(r_1, \dots, r_n) = r_1 + \dots + r_n$, and so on. Let

$$e_{k,j}(r_1, \dots, r_N) = e_k(r_1, \dots, r_{j-1}, r_{j+1}, \dots, r_N),$$

that is, $e_{k,j}(r_1, \dots, r_N)$ equals $e_k(r_1, \dots, r_N)$ with r_j removed, $j = 1, \dots, n$. Since $p(x+c)$ and $p(x)$ have the same ratio vectors for any constant c , we may assume that

$$r_2 = 0.$$

Equating coefficients in (2) using the elementary symmetric functions yields

$$ne_k(x_1, \dots, x_{N-1}) = \sum_{j=1}^N m_j e_{k,j}(r_1, 0, r_3, \dots, r_N), k = 1, 2, \dots, N-1.$$

Since $e_{k,j}(r_1, 0, r_3, \dots, r_N) = \begin{cases} e_{k,j}(r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N) & \text{if } j \neq 2 \text{ and } k \leq N-2 \\ e_k(r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N) & \text{if } j = 2 \\ 0 & \text{if } j \neq 2 \text{ and } k = N-1 \end{cases}$ we have

$$ne_k(x_1, \dots, x_{N-1}) = m_2 e_k(r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N) + \sum_{j=1, j \neq 2}^N m_j e_{k,j}(r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N), k = 1, \dots, N-2 \quad (3)$$

$$nx_1 \cdots x_{N-1} = m_2 r_1 r_3 \cdots r_N$$

Solving (1) for x_k yields

$$x_k = \Delta_k \sigma_k + r_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, N-1, \quad (4)$$

where $\Delta_k = r_{k+1} - r_k$. Substituting (4) into (3) gives the following equivalent system of equations involving the roots and the ratios.

$$\begin{aligned}
ne_k((1 - \sigma_1)r_1, r_3\sigma_2, \Delta_3\sigma_3 + r_3, \dots, \Delta_{N-1}\sigma_{N-1} + r_{N-1}) &= \\
m_2e_k(r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N) + \sum_{j=1, j \neq 2}^N m_je_{k,j}(r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N), k &= 1, \dots, N-2 \\
n(1 - \sigma_1)r_1(r_3\sigma_2)(\Delta_3\sigma_3 + r_3) \cdots (\Delta_{N-1}\sigma_{N-1} + r_{N-1}) &= m_2r_1r_3 \cdots r_N
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Note that this system is *homogeneous* in the r_k since $\Delta_k\sigma_k + r_k$ is a linear function of r_k for each k . This will be crucial later in our use of *projective* elimination theory.

2.1 Bounds

The inequality $\frac{1}{n-k+1} < \sigma_k < \frac{k}{k+1}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ was first derived in [4] and later in [1] for polynomials of degree $n \geq 2$ with n distinct real roots. Critical in proving the inequality was the root-dragging theorem(see [2]). We now extend this inequality to the ratios defined in (1) for functions of the form $p(x) = (x-r_1)^{m_1} \cdots (x-r_N)^{m_N}$. First we generalize the root-dragging theorem. The proof is very similar to the proof in [2] where $m_1 = \cdots = m_N = 1$. For completeness, we provide the details here.

Lemma 2 *Let $x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_{N-1}$ be the $N-1$ critical points of p lying in $I_k = (r_k, r_{k+1})$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, N-1$. Let $q(x) = (x-r'_1)^{m_1} \cdots (x-r'_N)^{m_N}$, where $r'_k > r_k$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, N-1$ and let $x'_1 < x'_2 < \cdots < x'_{N-1}$ be the $N-1$ critical points of q lying in $J_k = (r'_k, r'_{k+1})$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, N-1$. Then $x'_k > x_k$, $k =$*

$1, 2, \dots, N-1$.

Proof. Suppose that for some $i, x'_i < x_i$. Now $p'(x_i) = 0 \Rightarrow \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{m_k}{x_i - r_k} = 0$ and $q'(x'_i) = 0 \Rightarrow \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{m_k}{x'_i - r'_k} = 0$. $r'_k > r_k$ and $x'_i < x_i$ implies that

$$x'_i - r'_k < x_i - r_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, N-1. \quad (6)$$

Since both sides of (6) have the same sign, $\frac{m_k}{x'_i - r'_k} > \frac{m_k}{x_i - r_k}, k = 1, 2, \dots, N-1$, which contradicts the fact that $\sum_{k=1}^N \frac{m_k}{x_i - r_k}$ and $\sum_{k=1}^N \frac{m_k}{x'_i - r'_k}$ are both zero. ■

Theorem 3 *If $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1}$ are defined by (1), then*

$$\frac{m_k}{m_k + \dots + m_N} < \sigma_k < \frac{m_1 + \dots + m_k}{m_1 + \dots + m_{k+1}} \quad (7)$$

Proof. To obtain an upper bound for σ_k we use Lemma 2. Arguing as in [1], we can move the critical point $x_k \in (r_k, r_{k+1})$ as far to the right as possible by letting $r_1, \dots, r_{k-1} \rightarrow r_k$ and $r_{k+2}, \dots, r_N \rightarrow \infty$. Let $s = m_1 + \dots + m_k, t = m_{k+2} + \dots + m_N$, and let $q_b(x) = (x - r_k)^s (x - r_{k+1})^{m_{k+1}} (x - b)^t$. Then $q'_b(x) = (x - r_k)^s \times$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left((x - r_{k+1})^{m_{k+1}} t (x - b)^{t-1} + m_{k+1} (x - r_{k+1})^{m_{k+1}-1} (x - b)^t \right) + \\ & s (x - r_k)^{s-1} (x - r_{k+1})^{m_{k+1}} (x - b)^t = \\ & (x - r_{k+1})^{m_{k+1}-1} (x - r_k)^{s-1} (x - b)^{t-1} \times \\ & (t(x - r_{k+1})(x - r_k) + m_{k+1}(x - r_k)(x - b) + s(x - r_{k+1})(x - b)). \end{aligned}$$

x_k is the smallest root of the quadratic $t(x - r_{k+1})(x - r_k) +$

$$m_{k+1}(x - r_k)(x - b) + s(x - r_{k+1})(x - b) = (m_{k+1} + t + s)x^2 +$$

$$(-tr_{k+1} - tr_k - m_{k+1}r_k - m_{k+1}b - sr_{k+1} - sb)x + tr_{k+1}r_k + sr_{k+1}b + m_{k+1}r_kb.$$

As $b \rightarrow \infty$, x_k increases and approaches the root of $(-m_{k+1} - s)x + sr_{k+1} +$

$$m_{k+1}r_k. \text{ Thus } x_k \uparrow \frac{sr_{k+1} + m_{k+1}r_k}{m_{k+1} + s} \Rightarrow \\ \sigma_k \uparrow \left(\frac{sr_{k+1} + m_{k+1}r_k}{m_{k+1} + s} - r_k \right) / (r_{k+1} - r_k) = \\ \frac{sr_{k+1} + m_{k+1}r_k - r_k(m_{k+1} + s)}{(m_{k+1} + s)(r_{k+1} - r_k)} = \frac{s}{m_{k+1} + s} = \frac{m_1 + \dots + m_k}{m_1 + \dots + m_{k+1}}. \text{ Simi-}$$

larly, to obtain a lower bound for σ_k , move the critical point $x_k \in (r_k, r_{k+1})$ as

far to the left as possible by letting $r_{k+2}, \dots, r_N \rightarrow r_{k+1}$ and $r_1, \dots, r_{k-1} \rightarrow -\infty$.

By considering $q_b(x) = (x - r_k)^{m_k}(x - r_{k+1})^s(x + b)^t$, where $s = m_{k+1} + \dots + m_N$

and $t = m_1 + \dots + m_{k-1}$, one obtains $\sigma_k \downarrow \frac{m_k}{m_k + \dots + m_N}$. ■

2.2 N = 3

The following Theorem generalizes ([5], Theorem 1). Throughout,

$$n = m_1 + m_2 + m_3$$

Theorem 4 *Let $p(x) = (x - r_1)^{m_1}(x - r_2)^{m_2}(x - r_3)^{m_3}$. Then (σ_1, σ_2) is a ratio vector if and only if $\frac{m_1}{n} < \sigma_1 < \frac{m_1}{m_1 + m_2}, \frac{m_2}{m_2 + m_3} < \sigma_2 < \frac{m_1 + m_2}{n}$, and $\sigma_2 = \frac{m_2}{n(1 - \sigma_1)}$*

Proof. To prove the necessity part,

$$\frac{m_1}{n} < \sigma_1 < \frac{m_1}{m_1 + m_2}, \frac{m_2}{m_2 + m_3} < \sigma_2 < \frac{m_1 + m_2}{n} \quad (8)$$

follows from Theorem 3 with $N = 3$. With $N = 3$ (5) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} n(r_2\sigma_1 + (r_3 - r_2)\sigma_2 + r_2) &= m_1(r_2 + r_3) + m_2r_3 + m_3r_2 \\ nr_2\sigma_1((r_3 - r_2)\sigma_2 + r_2) &= m_1(r_2r_3) \end{aligned}$$

Since $p(cx)$ and $p(x)$ have the same ratios when $c > 0$, in addition to $r_1 = 0$ we may also assume that $r_2 = 1$. Let $r_2 = 1$ and $r_3 = r$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (n\sigma_2 - m_1 - m_2)r + n(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2) + m_2 &= 0 \\ (n\sigma_1\sigma_2 - m_1)r + n\sigma_1(1 - \sigma_2) &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Note that $n\sigma_2 - m_1 - m_2 \neq 0$ since $\sigma_2 < \frac{m_1 + m_2}{n}$ by (8) and $n\sigma_1\sigma_2 - m_1 \neq 0$ since $\sigma_1\sigma_2 < \frac{m_1}{m_1 + m_2} \frac{m_1 + m_2}{n} = \frac{m_1}{n}$ by (8). Hence we can solve each equation in (9) for r to obtain $r = \frac{n(\sigma_2 - \sigma_1) - m_2}{n\sigma_2 - m_1 - m_2}$ and $r = n\sigma_1 \frac{\sigma_2 - 1}{n\sigma_1\sigma_2 - m_1}$. Equating these two expressions yields $\frac{n(\sigma_2 - \sigma_1) - m_2}{n\sigma_2 - m_1 - m_2} = n\sigma_1 \frac{\sigma_2 - 1}{n\sigma_1\sigma_2 - m_1} \Rightarrow (n\sigma_1\sigma_2 - n\sigma_2 + m_2)(m_1 - n\sigma_1) = 0 \Rightarrow \sigma_2 = \frac{m_2}{n(1 - \sigma_1)}$ since $m_1 - n\sigma_1 \neq 0$. To prove sufficiency, suppose that u is any real number with $\frac{m_1}{n} < u < \frac{m_1}{m_1 + m_2}$. We want to show that (u, v) is a ratio vector, where $v = \frac{m_2}{n(1 - u)}$. Let $r = u \frac{(1 - u)n - m_2}{m_1 - (m_1 + m_2)u}$. $u < \frac{m_1}{m_1 + m_2} \Rightarrow m_1 - (m_1 + m_2)u > 0$ and $(1 - u)n - m_2 > \frac{m_2}{m_1 + m_2}n - m_2 = m_2 \frac{n - m_1 - m_2}{m_1 + m_2} = \frac{m_2 m_3}{m_1 + m_2} > 0$. Also, $u \frac{(1 - u)n - m_2}{m_1 - (m_1 + m_2)u} > 1 \iff u((1 - u)n - m_2) > m_1 - (m_1 + m_2)u \iff u((1 - u)n - m_2) - (m_1 - (m_1 + m_2)u) = (1 - u)(un - m_1) > 0$, which holds

since $\frac{m_1}{n} < u$ and $u < \frac{m_1}{m_1 + m_2} < 1$. Thus $r > 1$. Now let $p(x) = x^{m_1}(x - 1)^{m_2}(x - r)^{m_3}$. Then the ratios of p, σ_1 and σ_2 , must satisfy (9) by (5) with $N = 3$. Thus $r = \sigma_1 \frac{(1 - \sigma_1)n - m_2}{m_1 - (m_1 + m_2)\sigma_1}$. For any r , (9) with $\sigma_1 = u$ and $\sigma_2 = v$ is equivalent to $f(u) = 0$, where $f(u) = -nu^2 + (rm_1 + rm_2 + n - m_2)u - rm_1$. Then $f\left(\frac{m_1}{n}\right) = m_1(r - 1)\frac{-m_3}{n} < 0$ and $f\left(\frac{m_1}{m_1 + m_2}\right) = \frac{m_1 m_2 m_3}{(m_1 + m_2)^2} > 0$. If $r = u \frac{(1 - u)n - m_2}{m_1 - (m_1 + m_2)u}$, then $f(u) = 0$. Since $\lim_{u \rightarrow \pm\infty} f(u) = -\infty$, f has exactly one solution $\frac{m_1}{n} < u < \frac{m_1}{m_1 + m_2}$. Now $\frac{m_1}{n} < \sigma_1 < \frac{m_1}{m_1 + m_2}$ and $f(\sigma_1) = 0$ as well. Thus $u = \sigma_1$. That finishes the proof of Theorem 4. ■

2.2.1 Monotonicity

For $m_1 = m_2 = m_3 = 1$, Theorem 3 yields $\frac{1}{3} < \sigma_1 < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma_2 < \frac{2}{3}$, and thus it follows immediately that $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2$. $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2$ does not hold in general for all positive real numbers (or even positive integers) m_1, m_2 , and m_3 . For example, if $m_1 = 6$, $m_2 = 1$, and $m_3 = 2$, then it is not hard to show that $\sigma_2 < \sigma_1$ for all $r_1 < r_2 < r_3$. Also, if $m_1 = 4$, $m_2 = 3$, and $m_3 = 6$, then $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2$ for certain $r_1 < r_2 < r_3$, while $\sigma_2 < \sigma_1$ for other $r_1 < r_2 < r_3$. For $p(x) = x^4(x - 1)^3\left(x + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{13}\right)^6$, $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{26}\sqrt{13}$. One can easily derive sufficient conditions on m_1, m_2, m_3 which imply that $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2$ for all $r_1 < r_2 < r_3$. For example, if $m_1 m_3 < m_2^2$, then $\frac{m_1}{m_1 + m_2} < \frac{m_2}{m_2 + m_3}$, which implies that $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2$ by (8). Also, if $m_1 + m_3 < 3m_2$, then $n < 4m_2$, which implies that $\sigma_2 = \frac{m_2}{n(1 - \sigma_1)} > \frac{1}{4(1 - \sigma_1)} \geq \sigma_1$ since $4x(1 - x) \leq 1$ for all real x . We shall now derive necessary and sufficient conditions on m_1, m_2, m_3 which imply that $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2$.

Theorem 5 $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2$ for all $r_1 < r_2 < r_3$ if and only if

$$(A) \ m_2^2 + m_1(m_2 - m_3) > 0 \text{ and}$$

$$(B) \ m_2 \geq \frac{2m_1m_3}{n} \text{ or}$$

$$(C) \ \frac{n}{4} < m_2 < \frac{2m_1m_3}{n}$$

Proof. As noted above, we may assume that $p(x) = x^{m_1}(x-1)^{m_2}(x-r)^{m_3}$, $r >$

1. A simple computation shows that

$$\sigma_1 = \frac{1}{2n} \left((n-m_3)r - n - m_2 - \sqrt{A} \right) + 1$$

$$\sigma_2 = \frac{\frac{1}{2n} \left((n-m_3)r - n - m_2 + \sqrt{A} \right)}{r-1}$$

where

$$A = (m_1 + m_2)^2 r^2 + 2(m_2 m_3 - m_1 n) r + (m_1 + m_3)^2$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Thus } \sigma_2 - \sigma_1 &= \frac{\frac{1}{2n} \left((n-m_3)r - n - m_2 + \sqrt{A} \right)}{r-1} - \\ &\quad \frac{\frac{1}{2n} \left((n-m_3)r - n - m_2 - \sqrt{A} \right) - 1}{r-1} = \\ &\quad \frac{1 - (n-m_3)r^2 - (-n+2m_3-m_2)r - 2m_2 + \sqrt{A}r}{2n(r-1)} > 0 \text{ when } r > 1 \iff \end{aligned}$$

$$\sqrt{A}r > (n-m_3)r^2 + (-n+2m_3-m_2)r + 2m_2 \iff$$

$$Ar^2 > ((n-m_3)r^2 + (-n+2m_3-m_2)r + 2m_2)^2 \iff$$

$$4(r-1) \left((m_2^2 + m_1m_2 - m_1m_3)r^2 + (m_2m_3 - m_1m_2 - m_2^2)r + m_2^2 \right) > 0 \iff$$

$h(r) > 0$, where

$$h(r) = (m_2^2 + m_1(m_2 - m_3))r^2 + m_2(m_3 - m_2 - m_1)r + m_2^2.$$

We want to determine necessary and sufficient conditions on m_1, m_2, m_3 which imply that $h(r) > 0$ for all $r > 1$. First (A) is clearly a necessary condition, so we assume that (A) holds. Let $r_0 = -\frac{1}{2}m_2 \frac{m_3 - m_2 - m_1}{m_2^2 + m_1m_2 - m_1m_3}$ be the unique root of h' . It suffices to determine when $r_0 \leq 1$ or when $h(r_0) > 0$. Now

$$r_0 \leq 1 \iff 2(m_2^2 + m_1m_2 - m_1m_3) \geq$$

$$m_2(m_2 + m_1 - m_3) \iff m_2^2 + m_1m_2 + m_2m_3 - 2m_1m_3 \geq 0, \text{ which yields}$$

(B). If $m_2^2 + m_1m_2 + m_2m_3 - 2m_1m_3 < 0$, then it is necessary and sufficient that $h(r_0) = \frac{1}{4}m_2^2(m_1 + m_2 + m_3) \frac{m_1 + m_3 - 3m_2}{-m_2^2 - m_1m_2 + m_1m_3} > 0 \iff m_1 + m_3 - 3m_2 > 0$. That yields (C). ■

As noted above, if $m_1 = m_2 = m_3 = 1$, then $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2$. The following corollary is a slight generalization of that and follows immediately from Theorem 5.

Corollary 6 *Suppose that $m_1 = m_2 = m_3 = m > 0$. Then $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2$ for all $r_1 < r_2 < r_3$.*

2.3 N = 4

Throughout,

$$n = m_1 + m_2 + m_3 + m_4$$

To simplify the notation, we use $\sigma_1 = u, \sigma_2 = v$, and $\sigma_3 = w$ for the ratios.

For $N = 4$ Theorem 3 yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{m_1}{n} &< u < \frac{m_1}{m_1 + m_2} \\
\frac{m_2}{m_2 + m_3 + m_4} &< v < \frac{m_1 + m_2}{m_1 + m_2 + m_3} \\
\frac{m_3}{m_3 + m_4} &< w < \frac{m_1 + m_2 + m_3}{n},
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

In [6] necessary and sufficient conditions were given for $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$ to be a ratio vector when $m_1 = m_2 = m_3 = 1$. We now give a simpler proof than that given in [6] and which also generalizes to general positive real numbers m_1, m_2 , and m_3 . The proof here for $N = 4$ does not require the use of Grobner bases as in [6], though we shall use Grobner bases later in this paper to prove some results for N in general.

Theorem 7 *Let*

$$D \equiv D(u, v, w) = \begin{vmatrix} n(w - v) - m_3 & n(1 - w) - m_4 \\ n(u - 1)v(1 - w) & n(u - 1)vw + m_2 \end{vmatrix},$$

$$D_1 \equiv D_1(u, v, w) = (nu - m_1)(m_2 - nvw(1 - u)), \quad D_2 \equiv D_2(u, v, w) = (nu - m_1)nv(1 - u)(1 - w),$$

and

$$R \equiv R(u, v, w) = \frac{nv(1-w)D_1^2 + (nvw - m_1 - m_2)D_1D_2 + (n(1-u)(w-v-1) + m_2 + m_4)D_1D + (nw(u-1) + m_2 + m_3)D_2D}{(nu - m_1)(m_2 - nv(1-u))},$$

which is a polynomial in u, v , and w of degree 7. Then $(u, v, w) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is a

ratio vector of $p(x) = (x - r_1)^{m_1}(x - r_2)^{m_2}(x - r_3)^{m_3}(x - r_4)^{m_4}$ if and only if $0 < D_1(u, v, w) < D_2(u, v, w)$, $D(u, v, w) > 0$, and $R(u, v, w) = 0$.

Proof. ($\Leftarrow$ Suppose first that (u, v, w) is a ratio vector of $p(x) = (x - r_1)^{m_1}(x - r_2)^{m_2}(x - r_3)^{m_3}(x - r_4)^{m_4}$. Since $p(x + c)$ and $p(x)$ have the same ratio vectors for any constant c , we may assume that $r_2 = 0$, and thus the equations (5) hold with $N = 4$. In addition, since $p(cx)$ and $p(x)$ have the same ratio vectors for any constant $c > 0$, we may also assume that $r_1 = -1$. In addition, we let $r_3 = r$ and $r_4 = s$, so that $0 < r < s$. Then (5) becomes

$$(n(w - v) - m_3)r + (n(1 - w) - m_4)s = nu - m_1 \quad (11)$$

$$nv(1 - w)r^2 + (nvw - m_1 - m_2)rs + (n(1 - u)(w - v - 1) + m_2 + m_4)r + \quad (12)$$

$$(nw(u - 1) + m_2 + m_3)s = 0$$

$$nv(u - 1)(1 - w)r + (nvw(u - 1) + m_2)s = 0 \quad (13)$$

In particular, (11)–(13) must be consistent. Eliminating r and s from (11) and (13) yields

$(nv(u - 1)(1 - w)(n(1 - w) - m_4) - (n(w - v) - m_3)(nvw(u - 1) + m_2))s = (nu - m_1)nv(u - 1)(1 - w)$ or $Ds = (nu - m_1)nv(1 - u)(1 - w)$. Note that $nu - m_1 > 0$, $1 - u > 0$, $v > 0$, and $1 - w > 0$ by 10. Thus $D \neq 0$ and by Cramer's Rule,

$$r = \frac{D_1(u, v, w)}{D(u, v, w)}, s = \frac{D_2(u, v, w)}{D(u, v, w)}, \quad (14)$$

$$\text{where } D_1(u, v, w) = \begin{vmatrix} nu - m_1 & n(1 - w) - m_4 \\ 0 & nvw(u - 1) + m_2 \end{vmatrix} = \\ (nu - m_1)(m_2 - nvw(1 - u)), \text{ and } D_2(u, v, w) = \\ \begin{vmatrix} n(w - v) - m_3 & nu - m_1 \\ nv(u - 1)(1 - w) & 0 \end{vmatrix} = \\ (nu - m_1)nv(1 - u)(1 - w). \quad D_2 > 0 \text{ and } s > 0 \text{ implies that } D > 0, \text{ which}$$

in turn implies that $D_1 > 0$ since $r > 0$. $r < s \Rightarrow D_1 < D_2$. Now substitute the expressions for r and s in (14) into (12). Clearing denominators gives

$$nv(1 - w)(D_1(u, v, w))^2 + (nvw - m_1 - m_2)D_1(u, v, w)D_2(u, v, w) + \\ (n(1 - u)(w - v - 1) + m_2 + m_4)D_1(u, v, w)D(u, v, w) + \\ (nw(u - 1) + m_2 + m_3)D_2(u, v, w)D(u, v, w) = 0. \quad (15)$$

Factoring the LHS of (15) yields $(nu - m_1)(nv(1 - u) - m_2)R(u, v, w) = 0$.

Also, (13) and $r < s$ implies that $\frac{m_2}{n} - vw(1 - u) < v(1 - u)(1 - w) \Rightarrow \frac{m_2}{n} < vw(1 - u) + v(1 - u)(1 - w) = v(1 - u) \Rightarrow$

$$v(1 - u) > \frac{m_2}{n}. \quad (16)$$

Thus $m_2 - nv(1 - u) \neq 0$, which implies that $R(u, v, w) = 0$.

($\Rightarrow$ Now suppose that u, v , and w are real numbers with $0 < D_1(u, v, w) < D_2(u, v, w), D(u, v, w) > 0$, and $R(u, v, w) = 0$. Let $r = \frac{D_1(u, v, w)}{D(u, v, w)}$ and $s = \frac{D_2(u, v, w)}{D(u, v, w)}$. Then $0 < r < s$ and it follows as above that (r, s, u, v, w) satisfies (11)–(13). Let $x_1 = u - 1, x_2 = rv$, and $x_3 = (s - r)w + r$. Then (3) must

hold since (3) and (5) are an equivalent system of equations. Let $p(x) = (x + 1)^{m_1} x^{m_2} (x - r)^{m_3} (x - s)^{m_4}$. Working backwards, it is easy to see that (2) must hold and hence x_1, x_2 , and x_3 must be the critical points of p . Since $u = \frac{x_1 - (-1)}{0 - (-1)}$, $v = \frac{x_2 - 0}{r - 0}$, and $w = \frac{x_3 - r}{s - r}$, (u, v, w) is a ratio vector of p . ■

Remark 8 *As noted in [6] for the case when $m_1 = m_2 = m_3 = m_4 = 1$, the proof above shows that if (u, v, w) is a ratio vector, then there are unique real numbers $0 < r < s$ such that the polynomial $p(x) = (x + 1)^{m_1} x^{m_2} (x - r)^{m_3} (x - s)^{m_4}$ has (u, v, w) as a ratio vector. For general N we have the following.*

Conjecture: Let $p(x) = (x + 1)^{m_1} x^{m_2} (x - r_3)^{m_3} \cdots (x - r_N)^{m_N}$,

$q(x) = (x + 1)^{m_1} x^{m_2} (x - s_3)^{m_3} \cdots (x - s_N)^{m_N}$, where $0 < r_3 < \cdots < r_N$ and

$0 < s_3 < \cdots < s_N$. Suppose that p and q have the same ratio vectors. Then $p = q$.

As with $N = 3$, it was shown in [5] that $m_1 = m_2 = m_3 = m_4 = 1 \Rightarrow \sigma_1 < \sigma_2 < \sigma_3$. Not suprisingly, this does not hold for general positive real numbers m_1, m_2, m_3 , and m_4 . Indeed it is possible that $\sigma_1 > \sigma_3$. For example, if $p(x) = (x + 1)^{3/2} x (x - 4)^{\sqrt{2}} (x - 6)^2$, then $\sigma_1 > \sigma_3 > \sigma_2$.

Theorem 9 *Suppose that $m_1 + m_4 \leq \min\{3m_2 - m_3, 3m_3 - m_2\}$. Then $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2 < \sigma_3$.*

Proof. $m_1 + m_4 \leq 3m_2 - m_3 \Rightarrow n \leq 4m_2$. By (16) in the proof of Theorem 7, $v(1 - u) > \frac{1}{4}$. Thus $\frac{v}{u} > \frac{1}{4u(1 - u)} \geq 1$ since $u(1 - u) \leq 1$. By letting $r_1 = r < r_2 = -1 < r_3 = 0 < r_4 = s$ one can derive equations similar to (3) with $N = 4$. The third equation becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& (m_3 - nw(1-u)(1-v))r + nwu(1-v) = 0 \Rightarrow \\
& r = \frac{nwu(1-v)}{nw(1-v)(1-u) - m_3}. \quad r < -1 \Rightarrow \frac{1}{r} > -1 \Rightarrow \frac{nw(1-v)(1-u) - m_3}{nwu(1-v)} > \\
& -1 \Rightarrow nw(1-v)(1-u) - m_3 > -nwu(1-v) \Rightarrow \\
& nw(1-v)(1-u) + nwu(1-v) > m_3 \Rightarrow nw(1-v) > m_3 \Rightarrow \frac{w}{v} > \frac{m_3}{nw(1-v)}. \\
& \text{Now } m_1 + m_4 \leq 3m_3 - m_2 \Rightarrow n \leq 4m_3. \text{ Thus } \frac{w}{v} > \frac{1}{4v(1-v)} \geq 1. \quad \blacksquare
\end{aligned}$$

As with $N = 3$, we have the following generalization of the case when $m_1 = m_2 = m_3 = m_4 = 1$, which follows immediately from Theorem 9

Corollary 10 *Suppose that $m_1 = m_2 = m_3 = m_4 = m > 0$. Then $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2 < \sigma_3$.*

We do not derive necessary and sufficient conditions in general on m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4 which imply that $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2 < \sigma_3$.

2.4 Results for General N

We note again that throughout $m_1, \dots, m_N$ are given positive real numbers.

Lemma 11 *If $\sigma_1 = \dots = \sigma_{N-1} = 1$, then the only solution of (5) is $r_1 = r_3 = \dots = r_N = 0$.*

Proof. Let $\sigma_1 = \dots = \sigma_{N-1} = 1$ in (4), which gives $x_k = r_{k+1}, k = 1, \dots, N-1$. Note that we have assumed that $r_2 = 0$ in deriving (5). Since (5) is equivalent to (3), we can substitute $x_k = r_{k+1}$ into the last equation in (3), which yields $nr_2 \dots r_N = m_2 r_1 r_3 \dots r_N$. Since $r_2 = 0$, the latter equation implies that $r_1 r_3 \dots r_N = 0$. Since $r_l = 0$ for some $l, l \neq 2$, we may reorder the roots, if necessary, so that $r_1 = 0$. If $N = 2$ we are finished. Otherwise, follow the steps as

above with $p(x) = x^{m_1+m_2}(x-r_3)^{m_3} \cdots (x-r_N)^{m_N}$. That is, replace m_1 with m_1+m_2 , r_k with r_{k+1} , and N with $N-1$. We would then obtain $r_3 \cdots r_N = 0$. Reordering the roots again, if necessary, $r_3 = 0$. After a finite number of steps, $r_1 = r_3 = \cdots = r_N = 0$. ■

Proposition 12 *There are nonzero polynomials in $N-1$ variables, $Q_1, \dots, Q_l$, which do not depend on $r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1}$, with the following property.*

There are complex numbers $r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N$ such that

$$(r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1}) \text{ is a solution of (5) if and only if}$$

$$Q_1(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1}) = \cdots = Q_l(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1}) = 0.$$

Proof. For each $k = 1, 2, \dots, N-2$, let

$$f_k(r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1}) = m_2 e_k(r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N) +$$

$$\sum_{j=1, j \neq 2}^N m_j e_{k,j}(r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N) -$$

$$n e_k((1-\sigma_1)r_1, r_3 \sigma_2, \Delta_3 \sigma_3 + r_3, \dots, \Delta_{N-1} \sigma_{N-1} + r_{N-1}),$$

$$k = 1, 2, \dots, N-2, f_{N-1}(r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1}) =$$

$$m_2 r_1 r_3 \cdots r_N - n(1-\sigma_1)r_1(r_3 \sigma_2)(\Delta_3 \sigma_3 + r_3) \cdots (\Delta_{N-1} \sigma_{N-1} + r_{N-1}),$$

and

$$V_a = V(f_1, \dots, f_{N-1}) =$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1}) \in C^{2n-2} : f_k(r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1}) = 0, \\ k = 1, \dots, N-1 \end{array} \right\}.$$

Then the solutions in C^{2n-2} of the system (5) are precisely the points of the *affine* variety V_a . It is much more useful, however, to view $r_k, k = 2, \dots, N$ as variables in projective $N - 2$ space, P^{N-2} . Define the *projective ideal*

$$I = \langle f_1, \dots, f_{N-1} \rangle,$$

the ideal generated by $f_1, \dots, f_{N-1}$ in $P^{N-2} \times C^{N-1}$ and

$$V = V(f_1, \dots, f_{N-1}) = \{(r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1}) \in P^{N-2} \times C^{N-1} : f_k = 0, k = 1, \dots, N-1\}.$$

Now we want to use Projective Elimination Theory(see [3], Chapter 8). Define the *projective elimination ideal*

$$\hat{I} = \{f \in C[\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1}] : \text{for each } j, \text{ there is } e_j \geq 0 \text{ with } r_j^{e_j} f \in I\}.$$

Let $\pi : P^{N-2} \times C^{N-1} \rightarrow C^{N-1}$ be the projection map. Since each of the polynomials $f_1, \dots, f_{N-1}$ is *homogeneous* in $r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N$, by the Projective Extension Theorem([3], page 389, Theorem 6),

$$\pi(V) = V(\hat{I}) \tag{17}$$

Since $V(\hat{I})$ is an affine variety(by definition) contained in C^{N-1} , by (17) $\pi(V)$ is also an affine variety contained in C^{N-1} . By Lemma 11, $\pi(V)$ cannot be all of

C^{N-1} since $(0, \dots, 0) \notin P^{N-2}$, which implies that $\pi(V)$ is a *proper* affine variety. That finishes the proof since $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1}) \in \pi(V)$ if and only if there are complex numbers $r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N$ such that $(r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1})$ is a solution of (5). ■

Corollary 13 *There is a polynomial $Q \neq 0$ in $N - 1$ variables with real coefficients and which does not depend on $r_1, \dots, r_N, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1}$, such that $Q(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1}) = 0$ for every ratio vector $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1})$.*

Proof. If $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1})$ is a ratio vector of $p(x) = (x - r_1)^{m_1} \cdots (x - r_N)^{m_N}$, $r_1 < r_2 < \cdots < r_N$, then we may assume that $r_2 = 0$. Then there are complex numbers $r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N$ such that $(r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1})$ is a solution of (5). By Proposition 12, $Q(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1}) = 0$ for some polynomial $Q \neq 0$ in $N - 1$ variables which does not depend on $r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1}$. Since the ratios of a polynomial with real roots must be real, by taking real and imaginary parts of $Q(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n-1})$, it follows immediately that one can assume that Q has *real* coefficients. ■

Remark 14 *With a little more effort, one can show that Q has integer coefficients.*

Remark 15 *Corollary 13 can be proven without using Grobner bases or Projective Elimination Theory. Instead one can use some theory and facts about the Krull dimension of an ideal. However, this approach is really not much shorter and more importantly, it does not yield the sufficiency part of Proposition 12, which is a stronger result than Corollary 13. Proposition 12 can be used to obtain*

sufficient conditions for $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1})$ to be a ratio vector. Additional restrictions on $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1})$ are needed which would force $r_1, \dots, r_n$ to be real and distinct, with $r_1 < \dots < r_n$. One can also check if a particular $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1})$ satisfies $Q(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1}) = 0$. One then knows, without solving (5), that there are complex numbers $r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N$ such that $(r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{N-1})$ is an exact solution of (5). Then (5) can be solved numerically to see if $r_1, r_3, \dots, r_N$ are real with $r_1 < r_3 < \dots < r_N$.

References

- [1] Peter Andrews, Where not to find the critical points of a polynomial-variation on a Putnam theme, Amer. Math. Monthly 102(1995) 155–158.
- [2] B. Anderson, Polynomial root dragging, Amer. Math. Monthly 100(1993) 864–866.
- [3] D. Cox, J. Little, and D. O’Shea, Ideals, Varieties, and Algorithms, second edition(Springer–Verlag, New York, 1997).
- [4] Gideon Peyser, On the roots of the derivative of a polynomial with real roots, Amer. Math. Monthly 74(1967), 1102–1104.
- [5] A. Horwitz, On the ratio vectors of polynomials, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 205 (1997) 568–576.
- [6] A. Horwitz, Ratio vectors of fourth degree polynomials, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 313(2006), 132-141.

- [7] A. Horwitz, Complex ratio vectors of cubic polynomials, IJPAM, 33, (2006).